

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,249	02/19/2004	Walter Uebelacker	87072/1	2248
51108 7590 09/17/2008 DAVID L. KING, SR. 5131 N.E. COUNTY ROAD 340			EXAMINER	
			ROZANSKI, MICHAEL T	
HIGH SPRINGS, FL 32643			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3768	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/708,249 UEBELACKER, WALTER Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit MICHAEL ROZANSKI 3768 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2007. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) dojected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s)

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Imformation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTC/S5/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______.

Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

Notice of Informal Patent Application

Art Unit: 3768

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because element labels are handwritten. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3768

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by de la Fonteljne (US 4,702,249).

De la Fonteljne discloses a therapeutic shockwave device comprising a reflector housing 1', a parabolic reflector 2' in the housing, and an energy source 3', 4' in the reflector for devoloping a planar shockwave formed by the parabolic reflector (col 2, lines 35-55; see figure 2). In another embodiment, the electrodes may take on a spherical shape such that the initially generated shockwave is spherical prior to being directed to the reflector (see figure 7). The reflector cavity may also be closed with a membrane (col 2, lines 17-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller et al (US 4,608,983) in view of de la Fonteline (US 4,702,249).

Muller et al disclose a reflector housing, an ellipsoidal reflector 6 inherently with two focal points F1 and F2, and an energy source wherein a spark discharges between

Art Unit: 3768

two electrodes 24, 30 emanating in all directions within a liquid 4. The shockwaves hit the ellipsoidal reflector and are directed in a non-planar manner to a focal point in the tissue (col 3, line 45-col 4, line 48; see figure 1).

However, Muller et al do not disclose a parabolic reflector for developing planar shockwaves. In the same field of endeavor, de la Fonteljne teaches a therapeutic shockwave device comprising a reflector housing 1', a parabolic reflector 2' in the housing, and an energy source 3', 4' in the reflector for devoloping a planar shockwave formed by the parabolic reflector (col 2, lines 35-55; see figure 2). In another embodiment, the electrodes may take on a spherical shape such that the initially generated shockwave is spherical prior to being directed to the reflector (see figure 7). The reflector cavity may also be closed with a membrane (col 2, lines 17-19).

It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to modify Muller et al, to replace the ellipsoidal reflector with the parabolic reflector as taught by de la Fonteljne, because the characteristics of a shockwave reflecting off a parabolic surface as opposed to an ellipsoidal surface are well known in the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Accordingly, this action is made non-final.

In addition, Applicant's arguments regarding the 101 and 112 rejections in regard to inoperability are persuasive and are withdrawn.

Art Unit: 3768

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL ROZANSKI whose telephone number is (571)272-1648. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eric F Winakur/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3768

MR